



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/702,286	08/23/96	ANDERSON E	P1969/JAS-55

JOSEPH A SAWYER JR
SAWYER & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 51418
PALO ALTO CA 94304

LM01/0428

EXAMINER
HARRINGTON, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2712	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

File History Report

☐ Paper number(s) _____ is/are missing from the United States Patent and Trademark Office's original copy of the file history.

☒ The following page(s) 1 of paper number 7 is/are missing from the United States Patent and Trademark Office's original copy of the file history.

☐ The following checked item(s) of paper number _____ is/are missing from the United States Patent and Trademark Office's original copy of the file history.

☐ **PTO-892 Form**

☐ **PTO-1449 Form**

☐ **PTO-948 Form**

☐ **Other** _____

☐ **Other**

Art Unit: 2712

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Following rejection was necessitated by amendment of the claims 1-13.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (US 5,633,678) in view of Steinberg (US 5,862,218).

Regarding claim 1, Parulski et al discloses an electronic camera which captures and assigns a tag (claimed "mark") to a plurality of images taken (column 2, lines 1-5). Once all images are tagged (claimed "repeating step (a)"), the images are saved(claimed "one group function") to the storage (column 2, lines 58-65) through an user interface command switch (29; see figure 3; column 5, lines 55- 67). Although Parulski et al.'s system uses a "pre-capture tag system" for saving images, it would have been obvious to use a "post-captured tag " system, since

Art Unit: 2712

it is known in the art use such a system, as recited in the background of Parulski et al. invention (column 2, lines 14-20), to increase processing time.

However, Parulski et al fails to specifically disclose creating a **temporary** group of marked images. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Steinberg.

In the same field of endeavor, Steinberg discloses a camera system in which viewable indicators/marks are attached to images **temporarily** (col. 4, lines 39-44). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use temporary marks/indicators to images, as taught by Steinberg to change images for which an authenticated user is allowed to view. In addition, allowing the change of the image indicators or images associated with the indicator makes the system far more flexible/versatile.

Regarding claim 2, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 1., Parulski et al. further discloses the user may view a group by using the control panel (29) to select a particular group for display (column 5, lines 1-8 and column 7, lines 1-7; see figure 8).

Regarding claim 3, Parulski et al discloses all the limitations as applied in claim 1. In addition, Parulski et al. discloses an electronic camera which captures and assigns a tag (claimed "mark") to a plurality of images taken (column 2, lines 1-5). Once all images are tagged (claimed "repeating step (a)"), the images are saved(claimed "one group function") to the storage (column 2, lines 58-65) through an user interface command switch (29; see figure 3; column 5, lines 55-67).

Art Unit: 2712

Regarding claim 6, Regarding claim 2, Parulski and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 1., Parulski et al. further discloses delete functions for a particular image (column 5, lines 60-65; 52f).

Regarding claim 7, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 1., Parulski et al. further discloses depressing a select key on the control panel (29) functions to assign an image to file or particulars function (delete). Thus it stands to reason to unassign an image the user again depresses the select key to cancel the image (selecting none ; column 6, lines 52-59).

Regarding claim 8, Parulski et al. discloses an electronic camera which captures and assigns a tag (claimed "mark") to a plurality of images taken (column 2, lines 1-5). When reviewing images the tag (see figure 7) is displayed which has been repeated throughout the image taking process forming a group (ex. kids, soccer). Although Parulski et al.'s system uses a "pre-capture tag system" for saving images, it would have been obvious to use a "post-captured tag" system, since it is known in the art use such a system, as recited in the background of Parulski et al. invention (column 2, lines 14-20), to increase processing time. However, Parulski et al fails to specifically disclose creating a temporary group of marked images. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Steinberg.

In the same field of endeavor, Steinberg discloses a camera system in which viewable indicators/marks are attached to images **temporarily** (col. 4, lines 39-44). Thus it would have

Art Unit: 2712

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use temporary marks/indicators to images, as taught by Steinberg to change images for which an authenticated user is allowed to view. In addition, allowing the change of the image indicators or images associated with the indicator makes the system far more flexible/versatile.

Regarding claim 9, . In addition, Parulski et al. discloses the tag (claimed "mark") can be alphanumeric (column 5, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 10, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 8. In addition, Parulski et al. discloses the images are saved(claimed "one group function") to the storage (column 2, lines 58-65) through an user interface command switch (29; see figure 3; column 5, lines 55- 67).

Regarding claim 11, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied 10. In addition, Parulski et al. discloses depressing a select key on the control panel (29) functions to assign an image to file or particulars function (delete). Thus it stands to reason to unassign an image the user again depresses the select key to cancel the image (selecting none ; column 6, lines 52-59).

Regarding claim 13, Parulski et al. discloses an electronic camera comprising:

a memory device (18 and 24; see figure 2; column 4, lines 5-7 and 41-55);

a memory manager (column 4, lines 56 -67 and column 5, lines 31-51)

an interface coupled to said memory (column 5, lines 1-7 and column 8, lines 34-44);

Art Unit: 2712

an user interface for displaying (computer screen; see figure 8; column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 23-26) an image;

means coupled to the memory manager for assigning a mark function (tag) to one of the function keys on the control panel (29), such that in response to the user selecting (column 6, lines 1-4; pressing) the assigned key , a mark number (tag- alphanumeric number; column 7, lines 59-65) is assigned to the image to be viewed. In which the user may repeatedly perform this tag on several images(column 6, lines 60-64) to be viewed under the same tag (see figure 7).

means coupled to the memory manager for assigning a group function (date, time) to a particular tag (function key; see figure 3), such that the in response to a user selecting (pressing) the particular tag function, the group of images is collectively given the date and time (column 7, lines 23-40).. However, Parulski et al fails to specifically disclose creating a **temporary** group of marked images. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Steinberg.

In the same field of endeavor, Steinberg discloses a camera system in which viewable indicators/marks are attached to images **temporarily** (col. 4, lines 39-44). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use temporary marks/indicators to images, as taught by Steinberg to change images for which an authenticated user is allowed to view. In addition, allowing the change of the image indicators or images associated with the indicator makes the system far more flexible/versatile.

Art Unit: 2712

4. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (US 5,633,678) in view of Steinberg (US 5,862,218), further in view of **Parulski et al. (US 5,414, 811)**.

Regarding claim 4, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 1. However, they fails to specifically disclose a slide show function (displaying one image after another in a file) for viewing images. Although, it is well known, as taught by Parulski et al.

In a related field of endeavor, Parulski et al. discloses a digital image processing system which responds to the a view command from the user by loading several images from a file to display a preceding image and the next image upon command (column 8, lines 60-68). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a slide show feature in the system to reduce latency time in view a group of images, as taught by Parulski et al.

5. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (US 5,633,678) in view of Steinberg (Us 5,862,218), further in view of **Bullock et al. (US 5,675,358)**.

Art Unit: 2712

Regarding claim 5, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 1. However, they fails to specifically disclose duplicating the selected image. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Bullock et al.

In the same field, of endeavor, Bullock et al. discloses an digital image capture control apparatus in which a selected group of images(stack) or an image(see figure 18) is duplicated by saving the image(s) in another file (column 8, line 27-37) by the user selecting that feature form the graphical interface pull down display (analogous to function keys). As it is well known in computer applications, a file can be duplicated by saving it twice with different file names. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a duplicating function in order to give the user a permanent storage image source, as taught by Bullock et al.

Regarding claim 12, Parulski et al and Steinberg disclose all the limitations as applied in claim 11. However, they fails to specifically disclose duplicating the selected image. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Bullock et al.

In the same field, of endeavor, Bullock et al. discloses an digital image capture control apparatus in which a selected group of images(stack) or an image(see figure 18) is duplicated by saving the image(s) in another file (column 8, line 27-37) by the user selecting that feature form the graphical interface pull down display (analogous to function keys). As it is well known in computer applications, a file can be duplicated by saving it twice with different file names. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2712

include a duplicating function in order to give the user a permanent storage image source, as taught by Bullock et al.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Matsumoto et al (US 5,796,428) discloses a camera electronic photography system.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2712

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Harrington whose telephone number is (703) 308-9295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiners supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(703) 308-5399 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

AMH:



April 16, 1999



Wendy Garber
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700